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BEYOND SNAPSHOTS:
Tracking the Status of Arts Education in Arizona

Executive Summary

In 1988 and 1995, statewide surveys provided “snapshots” of the status of K-12 arts education in Arizona. These milestone studies showed a continuum of programs and a variety of strengths and challenges across the state. In the years since – even as landmark education and arts policies were adopted and arts organizations became important sources of enrichment and learning – Arizona’s educators and arts professionals have had to rely on local anecdotes, personal experience, and partial reports to gauge the status and impact of school- and community-based arts education.

To answer today’s questions about arts education in schools and communities, the Arizona Arts Education Research Institute and Maricopa Partnership for Arts and Culture, instead of another snapshot, chose to determine the feasibility of mechanisms to track formal and informal – or school- and community-based – arts education over the long term. Morrison Institute for Public Policy (School of Public Affairs, College of Public Programs) designed the Beyond Snapshots study to gather input from a selection of state arts education experts, teachers, and representatives from schools, districts, and arts and culture organizations. Data were collected statewide during the first half of 2006 through:

- Telephone interviews with a variety of district administrators and arts coordinators, curriculum directors, leaders of statewide arts discipline associations, and arts teachers
- Group and individual discussions with more than 20 arts and culture professionals from large and small organizations
- A web-based survey sent to the Arizona Department of Education’s arts database
- Reports from New Jersey, Kentucky, Ohio, Los Angeles, and the Kennedy Center

Each research component focused on: 1) the current statewide environment for arts education; 2) input on issues, innovations, and challenges; and 3) outlooks on an ongoing arts education “census” of formal and informal activities.

The project showed that:

- The status of arts education and its delivery in schools and community arts organizations continue to vary widely across the state.

Variety in commitment, programs, and resources is as true now as it was in 1988 and 1995. Arts education experts, district personnel, and survey respondents agreed that school-based arts education continues to range from high to low quality and from strong standards-based learning to hit-or-miss efforts. Some locales have
chosen to make significant policy and program changes, but others have not. Teaching artists and community organizations invigorate and expand arts learning in some places, while other areas have limited connections to external opportunities. A continuum of program quality is a reality among nonprofit arts organizations also.

- **Assessment is viewed as one key to the growth of arts education.**
  Competition for time and resources is a reality throughout Arizona’s schools especially in the age of No Child Left Behind and Arizona LEARNS. Assessment is viewed as an important tool to focus attention on the arts. The discussion of arts assessment, which is now a local task, appears to have shifted from “We don’t know how” or “it can’t be done” to a feeling that its time has come. Without more attention to showing what students know and can do, many feel the arts may continue to be “marginalized.”

- **Arizona’s arts educators and arts professionals appear to be ready for a regular “census” of formal and informal arts education.**
  A push for data on arts education is a nationwide trend today because few states, including Arizona, have the information necessary to evaluate the effects of state and national policies on arts education or determine the status of arts education.

- **A “census” should target both school-based and community-based activities and learning. Information tools should provide data to: 1) track inputs and outcomes; 2) connect, and grow, and develop; and 3) understand attitudes and outlooks.**
  New Jersey provides one model for an in-depth school-based census. This study’s participants want to have input into the tools and ensure that results are reported quickly back to schools and community organizations. The interest in tracking school- and community-based programs and accomplishments would set Arizona apart from most other states. Suggestions for data collection are shown in Table 1.

Whether this is the “best of times” or the “worst of times” for arts education in Arizona depends on an individual’s situation. However, the accountability and achievement requirements for education systems and the evolving role of organizations in arts education have created an environment that is different from 1995 and 1988. Today’s context has made information tools more important and, thus, more possible.

While arts education programs may vary across the state, the interest in improving it is common. Making it possible for all schools and communities to “gain the arts advantage” is a passion among many from education and the arts. Beyond Snapshots points to the readiness of Arizona’s arts educators and arts professionals to participate in state-level information and assessment initiatives that have been recommended, but not created, in the past. With online capacity, student tracking, and extensive interest in outcomes information, the creation of qualitative and quantitative products may be easier now than it would have been some years ago.

In fact, sponsors of this research have moved ahead with the development of pilot census studies and are considering other initiatives. In addition, the Arizona Department of Education sponsored Arizona’s first statewide conference of arts educators in October 2006. While this research was underway, the Maricopa Partnership for Arts and Culture inaugurated a networking and learning collaborative program for arts professionals.

To capitalize further on the opportunities presented by the current environment, arts educators and professionals should:
• Communicate the desire for statewide information on school- and community-based arts education to local and state education, arts, and policy leaders
• Participate in the pilot surveys of schools and organizations
• Provide investments for the development and maintenance of desired information tools

With such steps, arts leaders, educators, and professionals should be able to readily answer “who is doing what” and “how are we doing” so that schools and communities all have the best in arts education.

Beyond Snapshots: Tracking the Status of Arts Education in Arizona is available at www.morrisoninstitute.org.

### Topics of Interest are Common Across Schools and Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School-Level Topics</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>• Relation of arts to mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Education Goals and Plans</td>
<td>• Existence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Indicators of change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Technical assistance needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Specialists</td>
<td>• Number and disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student to specialist ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections</td>
<td>• Number and types of connections to community organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Relationships to arts standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Programs</td>
<td>• Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Types of classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Time spent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special, Afterschool, and Extracurricular Programs</td>
<td>• Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Types of classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Time spent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues and Expenditures</td>
<td>• Per participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Trajectory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>• Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>• Types</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Organizations Topics</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission and Goals</td>
<td>• Relation to arts education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Staff</td>
<td>• Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach and Connections</td>
<td>• Number and types of schools and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number and types of community settings and participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Programs</td>
<td>• Types, components, and goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Relation to arts standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Programs</td>
<td>• Types, components, and goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>• Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues and Expenditures</td>
<td>• Per participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Trajectory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts Education Topics</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes and Outlooks</td>
<td>• Leaders’ and residents’ attitudes on arts and arts education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Levels</td>
<td>• Public dollars and proportion to arts education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Private dollars and proportion to arts education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Proportion of arts investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher and Teaching Artist Pipeline</td>
<td>• Number of potential teachers in Arizona institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Credentials awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Retirement watch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BEYOND SNAPSHOTS:
Tracking the Status of Arts Education in Arizona

In 1988 and 1995¹, statewide surveys provided “snapshots” of the status of K-12 arts education in Arizona. These milestone studies showed a continuum of programs and a variety of strengths and challenges across the state. In the years since — even as landmark education and arts policies were adopted and arts organizations became important sources of enrichment and learning — Arizona’s educators and arts professionals have had to rely on local anecdotes, personal experience, and partial reports to gauge the status and impact of school- and community-based arts education.

In 2006, dispatches from the field are, by turns, distressing and heartening. For example, some educators say time and money for arts education are decreasing as school districts scramble to meet the requirements of Arizona LEARNS and No Child Left Behind (NCLB). In other places, however, observers report that NCLB and renewed state resources have enhanced the arts. Arts professionals tell of successes and setbacks as well. Clearly, arts education in Arizona is continuing to evolve. Yet without regular standardized data from schools and community organizations, policy makers and leaders cannot fully evaluate arts education policies, determine the status of arts education, or create a support system that builds on schools’ and organizations’ strengths. Leaders want to know:

- Who is doing what in formal and informal arts education in Arizona?
- What is the status of formal and informal arts education in Arizona?

Instead of another “snapshot” to answer these questions, the Arizona Arts Education Research Institute² and Maricopa Partnership for Arts and Culture chose to determine the feasibility of long-term data tools for school- and community-based arts education. Such tools would allow these key questions to be answered consistently over time and at any time. Morrison Institute for Public Policy (School of Public Affairs, College of Public Programs) designed a project to gather input from state arts education experts, teachers, school and district representatives, and arts and culture organizations. The results would:

- Provide an overview of “what’s happening now” across the state
- Show the level of interest in ongoing information tools
- Identify potential indicators and data points

¹ Status of Arts Education in Arizona Public Schools was sponsored by the Arizona Department of Education and Arizona Commission on the Arts. Morrison Institute for Public Policy prepared Transitional Times for Arts Education in Arizona for the Arizona Commission on the Arts (see www.morrisoninstitute.org).
² The Arizona Arts Education Research Institute is comprised of the Arizona Commission on the Arts, Arizona Department of Education, Arizona State University, University of Arizona, and Northern Arizona University.
Information was collected statewide during the first half of 2006 through:

- Structured telephone interviews with 17 selected district arts coordinators, curriculum directors, leaders of statewide arts discipline associations, and arts teachers
- Interviews with representatives from 14 Arizona school districts selected for variety in size, location, socio-economic levels, arts activities, and performance ratings
- Group and individual discussions with more than 20 arts and culture professionals from large and small organizations
- A web-based survey sent to the Arizona Department of Education’s arts database
- Recent studies from a variety of places and institutions, including New Jersey, Kentucky, Ohio, Los Angeles, and the Kennedy Center were reviewed for questions and directions in data.

Each research component focused on: 1) arts education’s current environment and changes over the past three years; 2) input on issues, innovations, and challenges; and 3) outlooks on a regular arts education “census” of formal and informal programs.

### Table 1: K-12 Arts Education Policies in Arizona and the U.S. Still Vary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>State Content Standards in the Arts</th>
<th>Schools/Districts Required to Provide Arts Instruction</th>
<th>Arts Course Required/Optional for High School Graduation</th>
<th>State-Level Arts Assessment</th>
<th>District-Level Arts Assessment Required</th>
<th>Arts Required for Certification of Regular Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.*</td>
<td>49 states and D.C.</td>
<td>44 states and D.C.</td>
<td>36 states and D.C.</td>
<td>1 state</td>
<td>8 states</td>
<td>31 states and D.C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*50 states plus District of Columbia

### Arts Education: A “Vast, Complex, and Diverse” Field

Arts education plays many different roles in schools and communities, and it is supported by a variety of state and local public and private institutions, although schools remain the largest and most influential source of dollars and personnel. For example, arts education provides instruction in the arts as a “core” subject along with reading, math, science, and other disciplines as defined in the federal statute No Child Left Behind. Arizona’s K-12 learning standards call the arts “essential” to students’ futures. Young people may be the most obvious for arts education, but they are by no means the only one. For any age, arts education is also a topic for lifelong learning and a tool for social service programs. Arts education provides the opportunity to learn about arts disciplines and to learn other subjects and skills through the arts. Arts education can be as integral to workforce, community, and audience development, as it is to academic achievement. Arts education

---

3 This is one description given by the national Arts Education Partnership to convey the breadth of arts education today.
also offers significant opportunities for cooperation, bringing professional arts organizations together with schools and other institutions. Ideally, because of their different strengths and assets, schools and arts organizations, form a “two-way street” for delivering and supporting arts education and advocating for vibrant arts and culture sectors in all communities.

In recent years, arts education for young people has become more standardized and focused on intentional learning. Yet, arts education is solely a school function in fewer places than in the past. Notable school programs today are most often based on learning standards and increasingly are presented in partnership with community professionals. Arts professionals’ involvement is shifting as artists and organizations facilitate deeper learning instead of providing one-time experiences.

Considering the diversity of arts education, the ability to analyze the impacts of its many parts is vital for policy makers and leaders inside and outside of K-12 education. Several themes emerged from this research that shed light on arts education in Arizona now and what the next information steps might be. These are described below. In addition, quotations from interview and surveys are highlighted throughout the report.

### Table 2: Today Many Trends and Realities Highlight Arts Education in Schools and Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K-12 Education</th>
<th>Arts Education</th>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Arts and Culture Sector</th>
<th>Society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State population growth</td>
<td>Growing research base on best practices</td>
<td>Creative workforce for a knowledge economy</td>
<td>Concerns for current and future audiences</td>
<td>Hectic pace and competition for work, leisure, and volunteer time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of students</td>
<td>Emphasis on learning and teaching to standards in school and community programs</td>
<td>Creative occupations</td>
<td>Evolving and increasing expectations for participation and depth in arts education</td>
<td>Lifelong learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and federal accountability requirements</td>
<td>Emphasis on &quot;instrumental&quot; benefits of arts education or arts as a tool to meet other goals</td>
<td>Arts-based businesses</td>
<td>Funding and resource constraints</td>
<td>Learning as leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning standards</td>
<td>Partnerships with community sources to address access, quality, quantity, or variety of school programs</td>
<td>Concern for education quality</td>
<td>Arts education as common ground for opposing viewpoints about the arts</td>
<td>Arts pursuits in leisure time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on highly qualified teachers</td>
<td>Rise of media arts and the crossover between career and technical education and arts education</td>
<td>Arts and culture as a factor in competitiveness and economic development</td>
<td>Cultural tourism</td>
<td>Aging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts as a core subject and a platform for integration</td>
<td>Schools traditionally as arts &quot;consumers&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities for mature workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School choice</td>
<td>Trend toward “joint venture” learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spending fewer years raising children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding constraints</td>
<td>Increasing interest in adults as an arts education target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Population growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition for time and resources</td>
<td>Informal learning in museums and non-school venues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public support for arts education</td>
<td>Filling gaps in arts education through informal learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tech connectedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capitalizing on the connections between arts education and arts participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seeking sense of place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Morrison Institute for Public Policy, Arizona State University, 2006.
The status of arts education and its delivery in schools and community arts organizations continue to vary widely across the state.

Variety in arts education commitment, programs, and resources is as true now as it was in 1988 and 1995, according to participants in this research. Arts education experts, district personnel, and survey respondents agreed that school-based arts education continues to range from high to low quality and from strong standards-based learning to hit-or-miss efforts. Some locales have chosen to make significant policy and program changes, but others have not. Teaching artists and community organizations invigorate and expand arts learning in some places, while other areas have limited connections to external opportunities.

Moreover, arts education remains highly decentralized. In some cases, programs at schools within a district will vary and even greater diversity is present from district to district. Some places have building-based art and music teachers and dedicated classrooms, while others have art and music “on a cart.” Still others have teachers that travel among two and three schools. Dance and theater continue to be available “here and there.” The disparate situations are often explained by variety in knowledge and attitudes among school leaders and teachers. In addition, money plays a role, especially for rural districts. The state’s rapid population growth also is a factor in differences from school to school. The demands of enrollment increases can limit the capacity of schools to provide arts programs, even when they want to do so.

A continuum of programs and quality is a reality among nonprofit arts providers also. A large pool of program options is seen as desirable by educators and arts professionals, but the wide range in quality and value can be confusing, particularly if schools are using limited resources to participate. Some of those interviewed noted that arts organizations sometimes seem to perceive education as simply a showcase for their work, relegating it to a form of group sales. To some respondents, too few large organizations had mastered new educational models that would be of the greatest value to both professionals and students. To these observers, lesser-quality programming could be upgraded readily, although others said that the necessary internal support may not be as readily available. Commentators at the other end of the continuum noted the strong connections among community groups and schools and the unique services that made a substantial difference in many ways for students and teachers.

Other community voices worried about schools not following through on arts initiatives. For example, substantial plans were announced with great fanfare but soon foundered, despite individuals’ efforts.

A Feeling of Insecurity is Common in Arts Education, Despite its Longevity

There’s always the fear that it’s the expendable program and that it could be cut any time.

Source: Interview and survey comments, Morrison Institute for Public Policy, Arizona State University, 2006.

Arts Education Feels the Competition and the Strains of Growth

- The time constraint (is difficult); teachers would like to do more in their classrooms.
- Due to high stakes testing, the arts are being chiseled away.
- It’s such a fast growing district, suddenly you have to add a class and art/music is put on a cart.
- The implications of AIMS and elective competition
- Inconsistencies in staffing ratios in terms of practice of 60 minutes; some teachers have a lot of prep time, some have none. How we manage to juggle things as a poor district struggling to make AYP. Most of their students are second-language learners and in poverty. Need to keep a good healthy balance so they don’t lose the arts
- The fear that it’s a prep period for some

Source: Interview and survey comments, Morrison Institute for Public Policy, Arizona State University, 2006.
According to these observers, the momentum for school-community partnerships simply could not be maintained in the face of other school demands and competition for resources. Another community professional mentioned that the lack of follow through was not surprising given, in her experience, the limited incentives and assistance for creating and implementing district-wide arts education plans. Such a combination strategy reportedly had worked well in other states to support, follow through, and implement long-lasting collaborative arts education programs.

**Concerns about a “Just for Kids” Assumption**

Arts learning for young people is a subject that nearly everyone supports, as is lifelong learning. Unfortunately in the eyes of some participants, when it comes to arts education the two are mutually exclusive instead of mutually beneficial. Some explained that they lack the foundation to be service providers for young people. In addition, the content of their work is generally not appropriate for young people. Time pressures, limited resources, and skill gaps prevent them from wanting to create new programs for youth. In addition, some feel their work in informal learning with adults is under-valued. Their focus on adults’ knowledge and experience was perceived to have resulted in less funding and assistance from grantmaking institutions. One person felt that concern for K-12 education had “taken over every agenda,” making it harder for already under-capitalized organizations to get the funds and support they need to operate.

Representatives, who were frustrated with the “just for kids” situation they perceived, recommended a redefinition of arts education to go explicitly beyond students to include informal learning, civic engagement, and community development. It was suggested that advocacy for regional arts and culture development could be enhanced through highlighting lifelong learning and informal learning among adults. Some locales have had success working with parents of students in arts education to enhance advocacy, but all of the parents who themselves are pursuing an arts interest offer another target group for regional action. This is not to say that there are no arts learning opportunities for adults. There are many throughout the state. What has not been explored, as noted in this project, is how those programs and informal learning fit into a regional emphasis on a vibrant arts and culture sector.

**Leadership as a Positive Common Denominator**

Arizona’s public arts agencies and institutions have a tradition of cooperation. The participants in this research consider arts education leadership to be on the rise from those at the state education department, in state and local arts agencies, and from other institutions. This promising situation presents the opportunity to many of a renewed commitment to even deeper expertise and leadership on such activities as arts education funding and increasing awareness among residents, school administrators, business leaders, and arts professionals about a broad range of arts topics.

Leadership is a common denominator in terms of overall arts opportunities also. When district representatives were asked if they felt arts learning opportunities were increasing or decreasing in their districts (thinking over the past three years), half said they have increased and half noted opportunities have stayed the same or gotten worse. The pattern changed somewhat, however, when the question was on the importance of arts education. When those surveyed were asked about their opinions
about changes in the importance of arts education, only a quarter saw the trajectory improving. Of course, “staying the same” may refer to maintaining programs of any quality. To many places, the status quo may be best place to be.

Leadership, whether from principals, teachers, parents, or arts coordinators, continues to be the foundation for positive outlooks on the status of and possibilities for arts education in schools. Respondents from districts with such resources as leadership commitment and the capacity to apply for grant funds were more positive than those without.

Some who noted improvements gave examples of significant school and community advocacy. (See Appendix A for all of the comments on Success Stories and Steps Ahead plus Setbacks and Worries.) For example, two schools in a district received Comprehensive School Reform grants from the Arizona Department of Education to upgrade arts teaching at every grade level. Staff development sessions showed how to incorporate the arts in the classroom, while residency and after-school programs provided opportunities for new experiences. Another district’s arts teachers organized around school-to-school arts equity. Their data motivated leaders to evaluate the district’s programs in relation to guidance provided by current arts education research. The review resulted in the school board changing policy and hiring additional art, music, and physical education teachers to equalize investment among the schools. Voters approved bonds in a third district for a performing arts center, while another district override paid for more teachers in the arts and other electives.

Improving Public Perceptions

Those interviewed felt the perception of arts education among parents and community leaders had improved somewhat in recent years. Several participants cited survey research sponsored by the Ford Foundation in 2005 that again showed Americans with and without children viewed “arts and music not as an accessory but an essential component of a child’s education….Arts and music hold a higher priority than athletics, foreign languages, or preparing for standardized tests, but a lower priority than math and science, history and English, and computer skills.”4 One district reported that parents are now more active in questioning the school board on how money is spent and how their children are taught. Parents in some districts have formed arts support groups. This trend was viewed as being on the upswing, in part, because the arts are competing with other subjects and functions as never before. On the other hand, some noted disappointment that while parents appreciate the arts opportunities their children have, that interest has not extended to school- or district-level advocacy.

Arts organizations reported still meeting skepticism among administrators about the value of the arts and activities including community organizations. These arts professionals often looked to parent organizations to influence principals’ outlooks. “You

Assessment, Quality Teachers, Competition, and Money are Critical Issues

The ever-present fear that the arts are vulnerable because they are perceived as “expendable” continues to be a concern, along with inadequate funds. But, other challenges also surfaced among observers.

For example, attracting and retaining quality arts teachers have become key issues. Also, assessment and evaluation tools were mentioned as vital to determine if the arts are being taught well. In fact overall, the discussion of arts assessment appears to have shifted from “We don’t know how” or “it can’t be done” to a feeling that the time has come to do more at every level. As one person said, “without a ‘hammer’ the arts will continue to be marginalized.”

Standards are important, and the “meatier” guidelines approved by the State Board of Education in June 2006 were viewed as a welcome step ahead. (Some called for detailed guidelines for time and money spent on the arts as well.) Yet, while the arts standards are guiding teaching and learning in many places, most agreed that accountability for doing so is lacking, and each teacher remains quite independent. The same is true for arts integration. Except for a few schools that have chosen to emphasize arts integration and professional development to implement it, most mentions of arts integration reflected individual efforts. A few noted that as schools invest in systematic programs for teaching reading or math, an individual teacher’s discretion may be curtailed. For example, a prescribed reading program reportedly left little room for teachers to integrate the arts with other lessons.

Currently, given the assignment of arts assessment to localities, variety among districts is not surprising here also. Some locales, reportedly, make minimal efforts. However, others have invested in systems and techniques that some observers see as possible state models. For example, one district administers a written assessment in every arts course offered. Arts tests are blind-graded by two different teachers. Visual arts students present their portfolios and read artist statements to evaluators from other schools. The student assessments provide openings for staff development as well: “Data are provided back to the teachers and administrators and the teachers are held accountable.” The final step is workshops where teachers and administrators refine the assessment and the curriculum. Another district representative described assessments based on the state’s standards in 2nd, 4th, and 7th or 8th grade. A third asks judges from other sites to evaluate the performances of their elementary and junior high band and orchestra students.

Still for many: “The primary focus and resources are going to math and reading and the emphasis is on high stakes testing.” Because they are not part of the standardized testing, the arts are often viewed as “stepchildren.” This issue reportedly is greatest in poorer districts. Ironically according to many, learning in and through the arts could help “level the playing field” for all youngsters. As one respondent said, “In some cases, the arts are the only reason a child might stay in school.”

Pulling students out of class for additional reading instruction or other assistance reportedly has affected teaching electives, especially at the junior high levels. Teachers have become less tolerant of allowing students to go out of class for arts-related classes.
and field trips. “It’s not about money anymore; it’s about time away from testing.” However, several districts noted they arrange schedules so that students have opportunities to do both — as well as to participate in the arts as performers and audience members. In one district, teachers and principals organize lunch-time drama clubs and musicals, plus kindergarten operas, student performances, and student exhibits at many times outside class time. “The arts teachers are looking for opportunities for students to experience arts in authentic environments, having an audience for what they do.”

Assessment and accountability were viewed as strategies for the arts to achieve real parity with other core subjects. To pave the way for change, some participants suggested the state’s educational leaders should:

- Make arts offerings part of the Arizona Department of Education’s school report card
- Include activities in the schools, such as the arts, in school ratings and performance labels
- Add a “bubble” on the AIMS test that would identify students’ arts involvement
- Hire an arts coordinator for every district

Looking for Quality Teachers, Especially in Light of an Aging Workforce

In a tight market, districts have struggled to find qualified arts teachers who also carry the required education certification. The concern for recruitment and sufficient arts instructors is growing as the teaching workforce ages. In fact, two of the 17 individuals interviewed here had retired at the end of the school year, and several others had been with their districts for more than 20 years. Numerous interviewees mentioned a shrinking pool of applicants because of a negative image of teaching and a limited preparation “pipeline,” among other reasons. To many, increasing the pool of potential arts teachers should be a priority. It was suggested that Arizona’s universities require students graduating with arts degrees to also have an arts education certificate that allows — and qualifies — them to teach. Several explained that from their perspective the state’s universities had not been encouraged to produce sufficient arts education majors.

Teacher retention is also an issue, especially for districts who cannot afford to match the compensation offered by other locales. Keeping teachers is tough also for schools in areas without strong arts communities. Tremendous population growth in many school

Districts’ Notable Arts Education Efforts or Local Steps Ahead

- Performance awards for students
- District performance evaluations for band and orchestra students in elementary and junior high
- Middle school art programs are phenomenal; Strength in the band and chorus areas; center-based arts with the technology integrated in
- A grassroots effort among arts teachers caused the administration to review the situation and brought about a huge change and a commitment from the Board to make sure there was parity among schools.
- Partnerships with the Scottsdale Center for the Arts and others. They’ve had Kennedy Center workshops for regular classroom teachers that show how to integrate the arts into their instruction.
- Last year the high school had 1 art teacher, this year they’ll have 3 art teachers. They went from 1 dance teacher to 1.5.
- Strong awareness of the arts and the integration of reading, writing, and math with arts areas
- They understand the value of the arts in education and have become more innovative in trying to incorporate quality arts experiences for students.
- The arts are infused throughout the entire curriculum. The local art teachers have a strong association.
- A written district assessment in every single course that is offered
- Arts in after-school and summer school programs and their district-wide fine arts evening
- The drama club where there were no extracurricular activities had a “wonderful” effect
- Quality of the magnet school programs is fantastic artistically and in their ties to academics and making connections for students.

Source: Interview and survey comments, Morrison Institute for Public Policy, Arizona State University, 2006.
districts makes the work harder, motivating arts teachers to find better situations. “Suddenly you have to add a class and art and/or music is put on a cart.”

The supply of professional development opportunities for arts teachers, grade-level teachers, and teaching artists reportedly still lags behind the demand. It was noted that many teaching artists may be unable to convey their knowledge and experience to students. In addition, arts specialists and grade-level teachers need more professional development around arts integration.

The Knowledge Economy Connection

The “knowledge economy” need for creative workers and those workers’ desire for vibrant communities are frequent topics in business and economic development circles. Representatives of arts organizations were clear that their work increased the attractiveness of their communities to knowledge-oriented companies and prepared youth to be the creative workers firms want. However, some of these professionals also expressed frustration that the business community’s concern for creativity had not brought them more attention.

When educators were asked if interest in the knowledge or “creative” economy had affected their district’s outlook on arts education, the response was often, but not always, “no.” Most of the experts and representatives felt that the messages about innovation and ideas had not yet sunk in. The arts, as some conveyed, are “so important to develop thinking skills to prepare children for a world none of us can even envision.” Some viewed local decision makers as “more concerned about NCLB and their school scores than they are creating workers for a knowledge economy.” In contrast, one district curriculum coordinator stated, “That’s what we refer to as 21st century teaching and learning and that’s having an impact district-wide, not just in the area of the arts.”

Some noted that the knowledge economy has had an impact in career and technical education (CTE), rather than in the arts. For example, some CTE programs have been expanded in some places to include courses such as digital arts, graphic arts, and visual media, while they are under an arts umbrella in other locales. The division between the arts and CTE can be confusing and counter-productive. For example, drama may be in the arts, but film is housed in career and technical education. The effects of this trend and the continuing rift between arts advocates and CTE supporters on the fulfillment of Arizona’s high school graduation requirement remain to be seen. Funding may also play a part. As respondents explained, CTE receives additional federal and state dollars, while the arts are not allotted more than the basic dollars. Given a choice, according to some, a principal may place a course in career and technical education. In addition, if an arts teacher becomes CTE certified, a school can classify their course on the career side and obtain more funding for it. Some saw this situation as potentially harmful to arts programs. One person said, “Fine arts advocates are not always aware of these ramifications; they just talk about supporting the arts.” Others thought it could open new avenues to the arts and creative industry careers.
Uneven Community Connections

Among survey respondents, 40% felt that partnerships between schools and community organizations had increased in recent years. However, that does not mean that all is well on either side. Some educators noted that efforts to create external relationships and programs are not necessarily encouraged or rewarded by district leaders. Thus, partnerships are often inconsistent between and within districts and usually dependent on one-to-one connections. While many are proud of what is accomplished with grant monies, others also perceive personnel being left to “raise their own” as inequitable and a practice that sets the arts apart from other subjects.

In many schools, the time needed to write proposals, implement awards, and administer grants still stands in the way of working with community groups. In–school arts educators would like to see arts organizations take a bigger role in organizing and facilitating the grant process. On the other hand, some arts organizations felt it is debilitating to work with the different structures and personalities in each place. In addition, school and organization players see the other as constantly changing, making it difficult for the institutions to cultivate lasting, mutually beneficial relationships.

Additionally, programming in schools by arts organizations was viewed as potentially becoming an excuse for not improving core programs or providing a substitute for school-based arts education. A variety of organizational representatives also felt that school boards, as well as district and school personnel, lack insights into what they have to offer students. They suggested more forums to showcase their programs and connect with the schools. For their part, school district personnel recommended in-service days to be able to meet granting organizations and obtain information about how to work with arts organizations. Several arts organizations felt that formal and informal arts learning do not easily work hand in hand. Some thought that funding sources were pushing professional organizations into doing more with school-based arts education, even if it was not their best interest given their limited resources and expertise.

At the same time, arts professionals hear business leaders ask for creative workers, but turn away opportunities to fund arts education. “It’s a frustration; the business model is being placed on nonprofits but yet corporations want the schools to turn out creative thinkers.” To make matters worse – in the eyes of some – funders talk about the importance of arts education, but do not put sufficient money into it.

Even with the frustrations, the school-organization partnerships were viewed as here to stay in part because of their powerful benefits. For example,

New Jersey’s Census Model

The New Jersey Department of Education is surveying all core curriculum content areas not included in the statewide assessment program. This effort is expected to shift the arts education “discussion from anecdote to evidence” through “rigorous and regular empirical research.” The New Jersey Visual and Performing Arts Survey is the first time the state has studied the implementation of its arts standards in every school. The survey is part of a broader New Jersey Arts Education Census Project, a partnership among the New Jersey Department of Education, New Jersey State Council on the Arts, Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation, Playwrights Theatre of New Jersey, and Music for All Foundation. The survey covers Quantitative Information (Offerings and Levels of Service), Facilities and Resources, Community Resources, Policies, and Instruction Support and Professional Development. New Jersey seeks to create a model and “create a national database of comparable information between schools, districts, communities and states.” Results are expected in late 2006.

Source: New Jersey Department of Education, New Jersey Arts Education Census Project.
large-scale university efforts are being institutionalized, and broad programs such as the 21st Century Learning Grant in metropolitan Phoenix and Opening Minds Through the Arts in the Tucson Unified School District are breaking new ground in collaborative arts education.

**Arizona’s arts educators and arts professionals appear ready for a regular “census” of formal and informal arts education.**

**No Statewide Profile**

Nearly all schools, districts, and organizations in Arizona can describe their arts education programs and initiatives to some extent. Yet, when several Arizona educational data experts were asked about sources of information to track all of K-12 arts participation, teaching, and achievement, they replied that such material is rarely available. On the community side, apart from grant records and informal networks, knowing “who is doing what” is also hit or miss. Without a central collection point with common definitions and time frames (as provided by the surveys in 1988 and 1995), it is not possible to create a state-level profile of arts education.

Arizona is not alone in lacking arts education information – whether on participation, achievement, integration, or partnerships. In fact, school arts programs had not been profiled nationally until the publication of *Arts Education in Public Schools, 1999-2000* by the National Commission on Education Statistics. A push for statewide data is a nationwide trend today because few states have the information necessary to evaluate the effects of state and national policies or to improve or expand the arts.

The Music for All Foundation is among the national organizations that have joined the call for regular, consistent statistics about arts education. The organization has “embarked on a multi-year effort to find quantifiable data regarding access and participation in music and arts education programs in public schools and communities across the United States. This effort has been a difficult task since, among the fifty states, there is a lack of an agreed upon definition for calculating and reporting student enrollment in arts education coursework….when the arts education community is confronted with the question 'How many programs have been added or eliminated?' we rarely had reliable data to provide the answer.” The foundation has contributed to the New Jersey Arts Education Census Project, the largest state-level effort underway currently.

---


Community Arts Information Gaps

Community-level arts education has many of the same information gaps as schools on programs and participation, according to study participants. But statewide information tools for networking within the arts community and among schools and organizations also were noted as lacking. Arizona’s arts education associations, arts agencies, and others have attempted to inventory and publish organizational activities numerous times in the past. However – despite significant coordination and investment in collaboration – Arizona does not have an authoritative statewide directory of organizations and services related to arts education.

As some noted, the lack of coordinated information resources puts arts education at a disadvantage in comparison to other issues. As one observer noted, every time arts education cycles to the top of non-arts agendas, it soon loses out to the next hot topic, in part because of a lack of information about the field. To this professional, arts education’s lofty goals and proven value are overshadowed by the truth in the old adage about “what gets measured (i.e., recorded and published) gets done.”

The results of this research indicate, however, that educators and professionals seem to be ready to fill the information gaps. Arts and education professionals recognize the power and necessity of data for innovation, equity, evaluation, quality, and advocacy. Most participants in this study noted that – given the opportunity for substantive input on tools and sufficient notice for implementation – regular “censuses” of arts education in schools and through arts organizations would be possible and valuable. In fact, three-quarters of survey respondents said they were “very willing” to participate in a census every two to three years. This positive response was also heard from the majority of those interviewed. Agreement was widespread as well on what should be tracked and collected. The participants in this study noted a need for three types of facts and figures.

Data to Track Inputs and Outcomes

According to respondents, an arts census should focus, in part, on cataloguing the inputs to and outcomes of arts education. Inputs would include such items as the amount of money spent, class offerings, and the number of art specialists. Because the arts have a long history in schools, but a relatively short one as a standards-based subject, some cited the need for more understanding of what constitutes a high-quality, comprehensive arts program at the district level. In addition, interest is high in tracking achievement in the arts and measuring levels of arts integration. The inputs and outcomes of arts organizations’ efforts should be tracked as closely as those in schools, according to the study’s participants. While many funders require reports on the impact of arts education grants and some have undertaken strong evaluation studies, an overall picture of involvement and results is not available for nonprofit organizations operating in schools and in communities.

Data to Connect, Grow, and Develop

Other types of basic information were suggested as well. Many mentioned the need for directories of school district arts coordinators and professional development opportunities for teachers, artists, and community administrators, as well as a compilation of programs and services provided by arts organizations. A “listserv”
of peers in schools and community organizations was also of interest. It was hoped that the Arizona Commission on the Arts would share insights from the Understanding Participation initiative throughout the state.

Arts education is something a number of organizations are involved in, but are not necessarily confident in. Some felt they did not know where to go or how to get support from university resources or other experts. While some interviewees felt that this feeling had more to do with not looking for help than assistance not being available, the issue of information to connect and learn appears to still be a factor in the region.

**Data to Understand Attitudes and Outlooks**

Nearly everyone surveyed felt it is important to collect information about attitudes toward and knowledge of arts education in schools and communities. This information would provide continual input for communicating the components and characteristics of quality arts education programs. In turn, this information would facilitate public understanding of arts education’s value. While individuals reported having created collections of research reports that highlight the arts and academic achievement, other study participants felt that a compendium or clearinghouse of arts research related to brain development, achievement, critical thinking, and other topics would be of value to Arizona’s professionals in their efforts to raise awareness about the arts.

**Creating the Desired Information**

Most of the raw material needed for the envisioned information tools is available at the school or district level and among arts organizations, arts agencies, and associations. Because the field is decentralized and diverse, data, at least at first, would need to be collected from the smallest units and combined for a state-level profile. Several models could be used to generate quality information, including:

- **Census** — A census – “a usually complete enumeration of a population” – depends on individuals completing questionnaires. A current example is the New Jersey Census of Arts Education. This statewide series of online questionnaires collected detailed, school-level information for grades K-6 and 7-12. This method could be adapted for community groups. A central point for communication, assistance, and follow up would be required.

- **External Surveys** — Most data-gathering efforts in arts education have relied on responses to census-type questionnaires sent by mail or made available online to targeted recipients. External surveys or those done via telephone, web, or personal interviews of a representative sample of the desired respondents are another option. Because of the wide varieties of situations in which schools and community organizations provide arts education and the diversity of programs, an experienced interviewer may be able to compile more accurate information better than other methods. This technique is used for most ongoing employer studies.

- **Hybrid** — Another alternative would combine selected existing measures and some original indicators into a tool tailored to arts education. An example of this technique is the “CAT Measures” (CAT = Connections, Attention, and Talent). Morrison Institute for Public Policy created this tool to track the return on investment from Arizona State University’s Proposition 301 programs. Specific to ASU but easily applied in other places, the tool offers a way of monitoring the inputs and outcomes of “301” dollars and tracking the return on that investment. The benefits of a hybrid would be the ability to develop
indicators that could capture the arts’ many facets and relationships not just to education but to such areas as economic development, the knowledge economy, and civic engagement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective: Track Inputs and Outcomes</th>
<th>Objective: Connect, Grow, and Develop</th>
<th>Objective: Understand Attitudes and Outlooks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Census</td>
<td>Directories of organizations, programs, and services</td>
<td>Surveys to track perceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples of high quality programs</td>
<td>Listserv</td>
<td>Compendium of research on arts education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directories of experts for assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Morrison Institute for Public Policy, Arizona State University, 2006.

Schools and districts currently report many types of data to the Arizona Department of Education and receive a variety of products in return. While the effort required to develop arts-specific data should not be underestimated, schools have mechanisms to collect, verify, and forward many types of student and program information. Nonprofit arts organizations, on the other hand, have fewer and different requirements, depending on their size, structure, and fund sources. Criteria such as organizational size, longevity, types of services, or membership in an arts education association may be needed to streamline collecting community information.

Time is another factor to consider. Survey respondents were asked to estimate how much time they would be willing to spend on an arts education census. This cross-section of school and organizational representatives expressed a cautious willingness to commit time to regular reporting. Several respondents noted that their willingness to participate would depend in part on the input they had into the planning, the time of year (referring to the school year) when the instruments were done, and the quality of the products they received in return.

With the desire for information and a sense of respondents’ potential commitments, the next steps could be to gather more input on study content and administration, determine what model best fits the situation, and test pilot instruments. One especially valuable source of input would be the districts that have done arts education “audits.” Another would be the information local and state arts agencies collect on grant programs. In addition, these agencies could offer important perspectives on identifying arts organizations at various levels and the best ways to target them. Current data collection programs at the Arizona Department of Education would provide another important source of input.

The potential complexity of describing and analyzing arts education calls for a broad-based coalition to provide for the guidance, buy-in, expertise, and investments to make and keep the project successful over time.
Continuing Evolution and Opportunity

Whether this is the “best of times” or the “worst of times” for arts education in Arizona depends on an individual’s situation. However, the accountability and achievement requirements for education systems and the evolving role of organizations in arts education have created an environment that is different from 1995 and 1988. Today’s context has made information tools more important and, thus, more possible.

While arts education programs may vary across the state, the interest in improving it is common. Making it possible for all schools and communities to “gain the arts advantage” is a passion among many from education and the arts. Beyond Snapshots points to the readiness of Arizona’s arts educators and arts professionals to participate in state-level information and assessment initiatives that have been recommended, but not created, in the past. With online capacity, student tracking, and extensive interest among funders for outcomes information, the creation of qualitative and quantitative products may be easier now than it would have been some years ago. The type of efforts that found favor in this study could provide a model for more information in arts and culture areas beyond education, including arts participation overall, community development, cultural tourism, and more.

Sponsors of this research have moved ahead with the development of pilot census studies and considering other initiatives. In addition, the Arizona Department of Education sponsored Arizona’s first statewide conference of arts educators in October 2006. While this research was underway, the Maricopa Partnership for Arts and Culture inaugurated a networking and learning collaborative for arts professionals.

To capitalize further on the opportunities presented by the current environment, arts educators and professionals should:

- Communicate the desire for statewide information on school- and community-based arts education to local and state education, arts, and policy leaders
- Participate in the pilot surveys of schools and organizations
- Provide investments for the development and maintenance of desired information tools

With such steps, arts leaders, educators, and professionals should be able to readily answer “who is doing what” and “how are we doing” in arts education so that all schools and communities have the best in arts education.
**Information Suggested for Arizona**

The Beyond Snapshots research showed that those in arts education in schools and the community are ready to tackle gathering new information. Participants noted the following items as valuable to know from schools and organizations and as a state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Topics of Interest are Common Across Schools and Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School-Level Topics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Arts Education Goals and Plans | • Existence  
• Indicators of change  
• Technical assistance needed |
| Arts Specialists | • Number and disciplines  
• Student to specialist ratio |
| Connections | • Number and types of connections to community organizations  
• Relationships to arts standards |
| Ongoing Programs | • Number  
• Types of classes  
• Time spent  
• Assessments |
| Special, Afterschool, and Extracurricular Programs | • Number  
• Types of classes  
• Time spent  
• Assessments |
| Revenues and Expenditures | • Per participant  
• Trajectory  
• Sources  
• Equity |
| Professional Development | • Participation |
| Facilities | • Types |
| **Community Organizations Topics** | **Description** |
| Mission and Goals | • Relation to arts education |
| Education Staff | • Number  
• Expertise |
| Reach and Connections | • Number and types of schools and students  
• Number and types of community settings and participants |
| Ongoing Programs | • Types, components, and goals  
• Relation to arts standards  
• Assessments |
| Special Programs | • Types, components, and goals  
• Assessments |
| Professional Development | • Participation |
| Revenues and Expenditures | • Per participant  
• Trajectory  
• Sources |
| **Arts Education Topics** | **Description** |
| Attitudes and Outlooks | • Leaders’ and residents’ attitudes on arts and arts education |
| Funding Levels | • Public dollars and proportion to arts education  
• Private dollars and proportion to arts education  
• Proportion of arts investments |
| Teacher and Teaching Artist Pipeline | • Number of potential teachers in Arizona institutions  
• Credentials awarded  
• Retirement watch |
Appendix A

Comments about Arts Education Success Stories and Setbacks

Respondents generously shared their insights into arts education through the web survey. Their comments are presented verbatim except where editing was needed for clarity or to maintain anonymity. Excerpts from these comments have been provided in the text of the report also.

Success Stories and Steps Ahead

People and Programs

- Twenty five years of teaching art to the community has created many bonds throughout the community and with generations of art students. Although life happens and students don't grow into artists, the basic ability to think creatively stays with them for the rest of their lives.
- I feel very fortunate to have a job teaching art fulltime. My students come in before school and come in after school hoping I will let them work on anything art related. They are hooked. They come back to visit me even years they have graduated, bringing me artwork they have done in high school or elsewhere.
- One of my Graphic Arts students submitted a design for the annual AAEA conference to be held in November of 2006. This design was chosen as a logo for the conference. This student had no real inclination for art, but her success of her submission being selected on a statewide conference has inspired her to continue her interest in the art field.
- District Fine Arts Annual Celebrations
- I do enjoy the City of Phoenix arts grants and the artist in residence roster and what it brings to the children.
- The district foundation has been an avid supporter of elementary band programs. They have provided numerous musical instruments for students who would not have otherwise been able to participate because of low and/or no parental income.
- Our district art show grows every year and the quality of student work is excellent.
- A tile mural at our Admin. building focusing on every school's art work throughout the district.
- Our school's super orchestra program for K-5!
- We had individual students receive recognition that greatly impacted their self esteem.
- We have developed some nice partnerships with other cultural organizations that are bringing special programs to our district and supporting at risk students.
- Our high school drama club visited an elementary school this year on 4 occasions to perform short skits and theatre games and this gave birth to a drama club performance at that school. This was the only extracurricular activity at that school.
- At the time of my hire, this district was looking for someone who could excite the students and give those older students, for whom dropping out was an all too common option, a reason to come and stay in school. Since my background is in art, science, and technology, I was hired to teach Art and Technology. I created an applied art program that adhered to the state standards for Art while also including elements from other disciplines such as Math, Language Arts, and Science. These programs were created to excite the student's curiosity and imagination while incorporating hardcore subjects into classroom learning. I started a number of programs with little to zero funding. One class is 3D Modeling and Animation to Teach Math and Physics in 6th-8th grade. This course was begun in response to several 8th grade boys who were on the verge of dropping out of school. I was asked to intervene. After speaking with them I found that they were most interested in becoming game designers. In this course through critical analysis, the students have been able to apply basic design principles to the solution of visual problems using elements of 3D design. They conceptualize 3D coordinate systems, construct 3D models, and perform mathematical computations as they apply to geometric construction. Their teachers report that all are excited every day to come to school. All are keeping their grades up and their newfound knowledge of math has been very apparent in their class work.
**Dollars and Needs**

- The primary thing that greased the wheels, so to speak, of arts learning at our school is money, which allowed us to obtain supplies, equipment, and professional development for arts specialists and classroom teachers alike.
- “Get to the root of what is happening in the classroom, have teachers share how the arts transforms children’s lives daily. More data on the benefit of the arts on testing and students’ success in life.”

**Steps Ahead**

- Making headway on innovative delivery model
- We have managed to re-implement arts offerings that were cancelled a decade or so ago
- Our district received a grant to fund a full time Arts Education position this year.
- We are encouraged by the increasing number of students going into art-related fields.
- More students are continuing in band in high school.
- We are implementing an arts academy in line with the Smaller Learning Communities Philosophy.
- Our Opening Minds through the Arts program has transformed schools, improved student achievement and teacher effectiveness.
- Maintaining a music and art teacher at each K-8 campus
- Through the development of grant resources my students and I were able to design and construct an amphitheater on our campus.
- The newly revised arts standards are receiving positive reviews. (Adopted in June 2006)
- I created an applied art program that adhered to the state standards for Art while also including elements from other disciplines such as Math, Language Arts, and Science.
- Increased participation by teachers in musical productions and presentations, integration of music into curriculum to reinforce learned concepts.
- We have increased the number of partnerships and grants this past year.
- Our program has expanded from a pull out option for students to a required, full year, scheduled choice for all students.
- ARTventure sponsored by the Arizona Community Foundation Grant Arts in the Communities/Arts in the Schools
- The Arts Initiative Grant allowed us to take some field trips and have visiting artists come to the school. This gave students a tremendous boost in motivation for participating in the arts.
- Applied for and received a CSR amendment grant to teach arts cross-curricular. Eight faculty were able to attend the "OMA" Fine Arts Summer Institute.

**Setbacks and Worries**

**People and Programs**

- The current emphasis on testing in education is affecting the way children think and learn. The arts are a way to balance out the current academic approach of teach/test. Need to emphasize the integration of more arts.
- Our elementary schools do not have music text books.
- Funds for adequate staffing of Arts positions—quality of arts educators coming into the field.
- Administrative support
- Keeping music and other arts in schools as districts are cutting programs and personnel in an attempt to increase teacher pay. Without arts classes in schools, there are no other arts education issues to discuss. This was a real possibility in my school this year.
- Available art teachers in the rural areas and financing the programs
- Supporting increased student achievement as measured in AIMS through arts education.
- Empowering citizens as interactive participants in the arts not merely as consumers or "enlightened cherishers"
Beyond Snapshots: Tracking the Status of Arts Education in Arizona

Cutting back on time spent with children, we are now on a 6-day rotation, 40 minutes with kids.

Decreased time allotment for arts, lack of arts integration opportunities, lack of scheduled time for band in district.

Strengthening programs overall - parity among schools in the districts - hiring highly qualified and certified teachers.

Lack of correlation of the arts to the basics of math reading and writing.

Providing a district wide curriculum for consistent teaching. We have no book or support materials except what is individually obtained by individual schools.

Adequate amount of time given Ensuring survival of programs.

Support for the Visual Arts being taught by the elementary classroom teachers in a district with no elementary art teachers.

Cutting art programs, focus on teaching to the test, lowered budgets for the arts.

Scheduling to accommodate increased enrollment.

The impact of NCLB as it impacts attitudes about the importance of arts education and funding for the arts in schools. Recruiting and retaining arts teachers, especially in dance.

Maintaining a high quality program in the Arts.

certified teachers teaching arts courses, arts offerings in school districts, financial support for the arts statewide.

The overall expertise of teachers teaching the arts. Money available to implement exceptional programs.

Using certified arts instructors. commitment from state to require k-12 certified arts instruction with money to back it. District’s commitment class size limitations.

Scheduling issues. The school "rating" of performing, performing plus, etc. is the basis for priority in many schools, and therefore receive special attention when scheduling classes. This applies both to the number / variety of classes offered, and when in the day the class is taught. These factors can have a huge impact on the success of a program.

quality of arts education and qualified teachers in the field. Professional development opportunities for art educators.

Maintaining current offerings in light of increased AIMS requirements in science.

Decreased time spent on arts education due to pressure of teaching to the AIMS test.

Maintaining/increasing enrollment.

Fine arts offerings at the elementary level.

State funding for school arts programs, 2) school arts programs should be taught by certified endorsed arts teachers, 3) arts leadership training for key stake holders.

external programming.

Finding qualified teachers who are committed to kids as well as the arts.

Continued partnerships, grants and collaboration.

high quality well educated teachers in the arts.

Competition

Effect on art education because of the NCLB act and making room for art ed. in an over populated school/district!

We have had cuts at the high school I work at because of AIMS intervention classes as well as restructuring of CTE classes. Yearlong Career Exploration classes have cut ours.

Canceling art so I can substitute in regular classroom, no art curriculum supported by the district, need a larger budget to support an art program.

Decrease in arts programs due to high stakes testing and cuts due to double periods of language arts, math, science, etc.

lack of funding/cooperation to ensure continued arts education classes - more time being given to reading/basic skills for AIMS test result improvements.

Dollars and Needs

Funding and opportunities for students.

Continued funding and research.
- Funding (this one-word response appeared numerous times)
- How to keep the money coming in for supplies and equipment.
- Money for supplies, staffing with high quality certified teachers.
- Funding, integration of the arts into the curriculum, relevance of the arts as a curricular medium
- Overloading of classes. (Using them as dumping grounds) Under funding of arts programs.
- Funding, departmental leadership
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